

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 19 and 30 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 25, 2008, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Paula for the courtesy of a telephone interview on March 19, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render the claim obvious. The Examiner agreed that the cited references appeared to differ from the claimed subject matter and stated that further search would be necessary. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated January 25, 2008 the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum ("*Staroffice*") in view of U.S. Pub. Patent App. No. 2004/0049294 A1 ("*Keene*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because combining *Staroffice* with *Keene* would not have led to the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “saving the first document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information, wherein saving the first document further comprises, in response to activating the privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document.” Independent Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation.

As stated by the Examiner, *Staroffice* does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. (See Office Action, pages 3-4.) The Examiner further states that *Keene* teaches the blocking or removing of data from a document deemed sensitive by a user. (See Office Action, page 4.) Applicants respectfully submit that *Keene* does not, however, teach or disclose, saving the document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information in response to activating a privacy option. Rather, *Keene* merely discloses retrieving information pertaining to an individual user's privilege criteria and determining which information contained in a database may be accessed by a requestor. (See *Keene*, para. [0007].) In *Keene*, when a guest user requests access to an object, a retention system extracts the requestor's user ID. (See *Keene*, para. [0047].) The user ID in *Keene* is matched with predetermined privilege identifications allowing the retention system to send a version of the requested object which reveals information to which the guest user has privileged access. (See *Keene*, para. [0047].) Nowhere does *Keene* disclose removing personal information from a document without regard to verifying individual user privileges to view such personal information. Rather,

the retention system in *Keene* maintains such personal information in the document for display to user's with privileges to see it.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine *Staroffice* and *Keene* because of the reasons found in *Keene*, including maintaining trade secrets, confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that removing personal information from both the file and memory representations of a document provides additional utility not taught or disclosed by *Keene*. Removing such information allows widespread document distribution without requiring all recipients verify user credentials in order to determine which information should be redacted. (See Specification, page 1, lines 25-30.) Therefore, *Keene* does not disclose saving a document with generic information replacing removed personal information without regard to a user privilege level.

Combining *Staroffice* with *Keene* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Staroffice* and *Keene*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "saving the first document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information, wherein saving the first document further comprises, in response to activating the privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document," as recited by Claim 1. Independent Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited

references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30.

Dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27-29 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27-29.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: April 25, 2008

/D. Kent Stier
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:sm

